

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-19, 21-36, 57-63, 73-82, 84-90, 112-124, 127-133, and 135-164 are pending, with claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 21, 23, 30, 34, 36, 57, 63, 73, 77, 84, 86, 112, 113, 122-124, 127, 136, 138, and 164 being independent. Claims 37-56, 64-72, 91-111, 125, and 126 have been cancelled. Claims 10-19, 21-36, 57-61, 63, 73-82, 84-90, 112-124, 127-133, and 135-147 have been withdrawn. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 148-155, and 158-164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Breen, U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0117735, in view of Hodgkinson, U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0126142.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which, as amended, recites that an embodiment is directed to:

A method, comprising:

displaying a media stream in an active area of a display screen, said media stream comprising a sequence of frames of fields, each frame or field containing a portion of interest that is smaller than the frame or field;

receiving metadata associated with said media stream from a remote database; and

in response to said metadata, adjusting placement of said active area within said display screen, such that said portion of interest is displayed in said active area.

Independent Claims 6 and 164 recite similar limitations. All dependent claims are dependent upon, and recite further features of, one of the claimed embodiments.

Applicants respectfully contend that Breen, alone or in combination with Hodgkinson, fails to teach or suggest a method which includes displaying a media stream in an active area of a display screen, said media stream comprising a sequence of frames of fields, each frame or field containing a portion of interest that is smaller than the frame or field, as claimed; nor does Breen, alone or in combination with Hodgkinson, teach or suggest in response to said metadata, adjusting placement of said active area within said display screen, such that said portion of interest is displayed in said active area, also as claimed.

The current rejection cites to Hodgkinson in discussing the limitations of Claim 164, which already included the above-noted limitations. Specifically, the rejection cites to [0031]-[0032], which describes instructing the video controller to fit the entire video display into a display window, or to fitting either the height or width of the video display into the display window. Applicants respectfully contend that instructing the video controller to fit a video's entire width or height into a display window is not equivalent to adjusting placement of an active area within a display screen, in response to metadata, such that a portion of interest is displayed in the active area, as claimed. In particular, there is no indication of any identification of such a portion of interest within a sequence of frames or fields by Hodgkinson; Hodgkinson merely fits the video display into the available area, with a few choices in which way to "force" such a fit.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that Breen, alone or in combination with Hodgkinson, fails to anticipate or render obvious the embodiments recited in

independent Claims 1, 6, and 164, and their associated dependents. Therefore, claims 1-2, 4-7, 148-155, and 158-164 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 62 and 156-157 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), over Breen, in view of Hodgkinson, further in view of Zimmerman, U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0007001.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1, reproduced above. Claims 62, 156, and 157 are dependent upon Claim 1, and recite further features of the claimed embodiments.

Applicants respectfully reiterate the argument above. Zimmerman fails to remedy the defects identified in Breen and Hodgkinson, in that Zimmerman similarly fails to teach or suggest a method which includes displaying a media stream in an active area of a display screen, said media stream comprising a sequence of frames of fields, each frame or field containing a portion of interest that is smaller than the frame or field, as claimed; nor does Breen, alone or in combination with Hodgkinson, teach or suggest in response to said metadata, adjusting placement of said active area within said display screen, such that said portion of interest is displayed in said active area, also as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that Breen, alone or in combination with Hodgkinson and Zimmerman, fails to anticipate or render obvious the embodiments recited in Claims 62, 156, and 157. Therefore, these claims overcome the rejection under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

KALEIDESCAPE, INC.

Date: June 20, 2011

/Kevin Brown/

Kevin A. Brown
Reg. No. 56,303
IP Counsel, Kaleidescape, Inc.
440 Potrero Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4117
(650) 625-6391